

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 through 6 and 15 through 27 remain in this case, claims 7 through 14 being cancelled, claims 1, 15, and 16 being amended, and claims 20 through 27 being added by this response. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Specifically:

The amendments to claim 1 are supported by claim 7 and page 10, lines 11-12 of the application as filed.

The amendments to claim 15 are supported by Fig. 1, page 4, lines 6-8, and page 8, lines 1-2 of the application as filed.

New claim 20 is supported by page 8, lines 1-2 of the application as filed.

New claim 21 is supported by page 10, lines 12-17 of the application as filed.

New claim 22 is supported by page 10, lines 20-29 of the application as filed.

New claim 23 is supported by page 10, lines 29-30 of the application as filed.

New claim 24 is supported by page 10, lines 12-17 of the application as filed.

New claim 25 is supported by page 8, lines 1-2 of the application as filed.

New claim 26 is supported by page 5, lines 25-29 of the application as filed.

New claim 27 is supported by page 8, lines 1-2 of the application as filed.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

The Applicant's agent, Kraig Haverstick, and the Applicant, Robert G. Combs, thank Examiner Heather Rae Jones for discussing the case in a telephone interview on October 29, 2009.

There were no exhibits shown or demonstrations exhibited during the telephonic interview.

Claims 1 and 15 was discussed in the interview. Laird *et al.* and Auty *et al.*, both prior art of record, were discussed during the interview.

Proposed amendments to claims 1 and 15 were discussed with respect to the current rejections in the final Office Action.

No general agreement was reached with respect to the claims. Agreement was reached that the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 15 of displaying digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on a single display would overcome the current prior art rejections.

The Applicant's agent agreed to discuss the claims by telephone with the Examiner if the Examiner found allowable subject matter in a dependent claim upon further review and searching.

Applicant believes that this statement satisfies the requirements to file a Statement of the Substance of the Interview and accurately represents the substance of the interview conducted. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicant's agent would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

A supplemental information disclosure statement is being filed with the present response.

The numbered paragraphs below correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the Office Action.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

3. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Laird *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,361).

Claim 1 has been amended as discussed during the telephone interview with the Examiner to include, in part, “a display for control of said testing system and presentation of said digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on the display to a user during review”, which the Examiner indicated during the interview would overcome the current rejections.

Laird does not disclose digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on a display during review.

Claim 1 has been further amended to include “wherein the display displays each data type, whether digital data, serial data, or video data, in a time-synchronized manner in the separate windows based on the time tags”. Laird does not disclose such a feature.

Laird does not disclose each and every element of Applicant’s amended claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection of independent claim 1 as being anticipated by Laird is overcome. Dependent claims 3-6, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 1, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 are respectfully requested.

Laird also does not disclose the features of new claims 24-27, which are dependent upon independent claim 1.

Claim 15 has been amended as discussed during the telephone interview with the Examiner to include, in part, the step of “displaying said digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on a single display in a time-synchronized manner based on time tags”, which the Examiner indicated during the interview would overcome the current rejections.

Laird does not disclose displaying digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on a single display.

Claim 15 has been further amended to include the step of “operatively interconnecting a testing system to the automated system”. Laird does not disclose such a feature.

Laird does not disclose each and every element of Applicant’s amended claim 15. Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that independent claim 15 is not anticipated by Laird. Dependent claims 16-18, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 15, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-18 are respectfully requested.

Laird also does not disclose the features of new claims 20-23, which are dependent upon independent claim 15.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

5. Claims 2, 8, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laird *et al.* in view of Auty *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,161).

Claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends, has been amended as discussed during the telephone interview with the Examiner to include, in part, “a display for control of said testing system and presentation of said digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on the display to a user during review”, which the Examiner indicated during the interview would overcome the current rejections.

Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on a display during review.

Claim 1 has been further amended to include “wherein the display displays each data type, whether digital data, serial data, or video data, in a time-synchronized manner in the separate windows based on the time tags”. Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a feature.

Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant’s amended claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that independent claim 1 is not obvious over Laird in view of Auty. Dependent claim 2, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 1, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations it contains. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 are respectfully requested.

Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of new claims 24-27, which are dependent upon independent claim 1.

Claim 15 has been amended as discussed during the telephone interview with the Examiner to include, in part, the step of “displaying said digital data, serial data, and video data

in separate windows on a single display in a time-synchronized manner based on time tags”, which the Examiner indicated during the interview would overcome the current rejections.

Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest displaying digital data, serial data, and video data in separate windows on a single display.

Claim 15 has been further amended to include the step of “operatively interconnecting a testing system to the automated system”. Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest such a feature.

Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicant’s amended claim 15. Therefore, it is respectfully suggested that independent claim 1 is not obvious over Laird in view of Auty. Dependent claim 19, being dependent upon and further limiting independent claim 15, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations it contains. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 are respectfully requested.

Neither Laird nor Auty, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features of new claims 20-23, which are dependent upon independent claim 15.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicant’s agent would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
-- Robert G. Combs --

By: /KLH #57457/
-- Kraig Haverstick, Reg. No. 57,457 --
Agent for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: November 4, 2009